

## Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 058908

17

ORIGIN EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 NEA-10 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 DODE-00 ACDA-19 OMB-01 /101 R

66623

DRAFTED BY:OASD:ISA:CVMCLAUGHLIN

APPROVED BY:EUR:RPM:EJSTREATOR, JR.

OASD:ISA:BGEM. HLOBDELL

NEA:GRK:JDAY (INFO)

EUR:RPM:LTC RTHOMPSON

OASD:PA: AND E:MR. WOODS

PM:ISP:JGRAHAM

EUR:RPM:WROMINE:ACFLOYD

----- 072434

R 232256Z MAR 74

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION NATO

INFO AMEMBASSY ATHENS

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USDELMC

S E C R E T STATE 058908

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y (OMISSION OF LINE IN PARA SIX  
SUBPARA TWO)

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS:MCAP, NATO, GR

REF: (A) STATE 42348, (B) MCM-14-74, (C) USNATO 1262

SECTION I. INTRODUCTION.

1. THIS MESSAGE PROVIDES SPECIFIC GUIDANCE FOR MISSION USE  
DURING CONTINUING DRC REVIEW OF GREEK FORCE PROPOSALS/  
GOALS. THE GENERAL APPROACH USED IN DEVELOPING THIS GUID-  
SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 058908

ANCE WAS DESCRIBED IN REF (A). FYI: WE REITERATE THAT THE  
CONCEPT EMPLOYED IN ARRIVING AT US PROPOSED FORCE GOALS  
DOES NOT ATTEMPT TO SUPPLANT THE MILITARY CONSIDERATIONS  
EXPRESSED AS MC PRIORITIES IN FORCE PROPOSALS. RATHER, IT

USES THOSE PROPOSALS AS A DEPARTURE POINT TO INTERWEAVE ECONOMIC, POLITICAL, AND USG POLICY CONSIDERATIONS INTO THE FORCE PLANNING PROCESSES OF THE ALLIANCE. END FYI.

2. AS DESCRIBED IN REF (A), OUR "REASONABLE CHALLENGE" FOR NATO COUNTRIES WAS DEFINED AS THE INCREMENTAL FUNDS -- OVER AND ABOVE CURRENT NATIONAL EXPENDITURE PLANS -- THAT COUNTRIES WOULD HAVE DURING 1975-80 IF THEY MAINTAINED THEIR CURRENT PERCENTAGE OF GNP DEVOTED TO DEFENSE. IN THE CASE OF GREECE OUR "REASONABLE CHALLENGE" WOULD BE AN ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURE OF 28,850 MILLION GREEK DRACHMAE, OR AN INCREASE OF ABOUT TWENTY-THREE PERCENT OVER AND ABOVE OUR PROJECTION OF CURRENTLY PLANNED 1975-80 EXPENDITURES

(123,949 MILLION GREEK DRACHMAE).

3. HAVE ALSO FOLLOWED THE PROCEDURE DESCRIBED IN REF A FOR DISTILLING A U.S. PROPOSED LIST OF PRIORITY FORCE GOALS OUT OF REF B. IN THE CASE OF GREECE, NARROWING THE CRITERIA FOR PRIORITY ONE TO THOSE FORCE PROPOSALS WHICH SEEM TO ADVANCE NATO'S FORCE STRUCTURE TOWARDS THE OBJECTIVES EMPHASIZED BY SECRETARY SCHLESINGER HAS RESULTED IN THE PROPOSED FORCE GOALS INCLUDED BELOW IN TABLES III-1 THROUGH -3.

4. WE ASSUME MISSION WILL WORK CLOSELY WITH DELEGATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL STAFF IN CARRYING OUT APPROPRIATE MISSIONARY WORK.

5. THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS PROVIDE DETAILS ON THE FORCE PROPOSALS FOR GREECE.

SECTION II: COMPUTATION OF "REASONABLE CHALLENGE" EXPENDITURE TARGETS FOR GREECE.

1. THIS SECTION DESCRIBES THE PROCESS USED TO ESTABLISH OUR REASONABLE CHALLENGE EXPENDITURE TARGETS FOR GREECE. A SUMMARY OF THE KEY STEPS IS PRESENTED BELOW FOLLOWED BY A GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF DATA SOURCES AND ASSUMPTIONS.

1972 CONSTANT PRICES - DRACHMAE IN MILLIONS

(1)	(2)	(3)
PROJECTED	PERCENTAGE	1975-80 DEFENSE
SECRET		

PAGE 03 STATE 058908

1975-80	GNP CURRENTLY	EXPENDITURES TARGET
GNP	DEVOTED TO	BASED ON MAINTAINING

2,910,458	5.25 PERCENT
-----------	--------------

(4)	(5)	(6)
PROJECTED	"REASONABLE	"REASONABLE CHALLENGE"
1975-80 DEFENSE	CHALLENGE"	AS A PERCENT OF
EXPENDITURES	(DIFFERENCE BE-	PROJECTED EXPENDITURES
BASED ON CUR-	TWEEN TARGET AND BASED ON NATIONAL PLANS	
RENT NATIONAL	NATIONAL PLANS)	
PLANS		

123,949	28,850	23.2 PERCENT
---------	--------	--------------

SUMMARY OF KEY STEPS

2. FIRST, WE PROJECTED TOTAL GREEK GNP FOR 1975 THROUGH 1980 (COL. 1). NEXT, WE DETERMINED THE TOTAL FUNDS THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR DEFENSE DURING 1975-1980 IF GREECE ADHERED TO MINISTERIAL GUIDANCE CALLING FOR NATIONS TO ALLOCATE AT LEAST A CONSTANT SHARE OF THEIR NATIONAL WEALTH, I.E., THEIR GNP TO DEFENSE (COL. 3). WE THEN DETERMINED WHAT FUNDS GREECE WOULD HAVE AVAILABLE FOR DEFENSE DURING 1975-1980 BASED ON CURRENT NATIONAL EXPENDITURE PLANS (COL. 4). WE ASSUMED THAT THE FORCE PROPOSALS ALREADY IN NATIONAL FORCE PLANS WOULD BE FUNDED OUT OF THE AMOUNTS SHOWN IN COL. 4 AND THAT ADDITIONAL FUNDING, OVER AND ABOVE THE AMOUNTS SHOWN IN COL. 4, WOULD BE NECESSARY TO FUND ANY ADDITIONAL FORCE PROPOSALS (OTHER THAN NO COST/LOW COST PROPOSALS). COL. 5 IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN TOTAL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES BASED ON MAINTAINING THE CURRENT GNP PERCENTAGE (COL. 3) AND TOTAL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES BASED ON CURRENT NATIONAL EXPENDITURE PLANS (COL. 4). THIS FIGURE (DR. 28.9 BILLION) REPRESENTS OUR PROPOSED REASONABLE CHALLENGE THE INCREMENTAL AMOUNT GREECE WOULD BE EXPECTED TO DEVOTE TO DEFENSE TO FUND PRIORITY ONE FORCE PROPOSALS THAT ARE NOT ALREADY IN COUNTRY PLANS.

DATA SOURCES AND ASSUMPTIONS

3. PRICE BASE: ALL COMPUTATIONS WERE DEVELOPED ON THE BASIS OF 1972 CONSTANT PRICES. THIS WAS THE PRICE BASE USED BY SHAPE TECHNICAL CENTER IN ITS COST ESTIMATES OF THE FORCE PROPOSALS.

SECRET

PAGE 04 STATE 058908

4. GNP PROJECTIONS (COL. 1): GNP PROJECTIONS ARE BASED ON INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM USG AGENCIES. BASED ON THE INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO US, REAL GNP GROWTH FOR 1973 IS ESTIMATED AT AROUND 8 PERCENT. FOR 1974, DUE TO THE IMPACT OF THE ENERGY CRISIS, REAL GROWTH IS ESTIMATED AT 6.5 PERCENT. FOR THE LONG RUN, I.E., THROUGH 1980, GREEK GNP IS EXPECTED TO GROW AT AN ANNUAL RATE OF 7 TO 7.5 PERCENT. ACCORDINGLY, WE ASSUMED A 7.25 PERCENT PER YEAR REAL INCREASE FOR 1975 THROUGH 1980.

5. CURRENT GNP PERCENTAGE DEVOTED TO DEFENSE (COL. 2): THIS FIGURE, CALCULATED USING THE GNP PERCENTAGES SHOWN IN NATO DOCUMENT ISM(73)11, REPRESENTS THE AVERAGE OF THE 1972 AND 1973 GREEK GNP PERCENTAGES. SINCE GNP PERCENTAGES WILL FLUCTUATE FROM YEAR TO YEAR AND SINCE 1973

DATA IS STILL SUBJECT TO CHANGE, THE AVERAGE FOR THE TWO MOST RECENT YEARS, 1972 AND 1973, WAS CONSIDERED TO BE A MORE REPRESENTATIVE INDICATION OF A COUNTRY'S RECENT EFFORT THAN EITHER 1972 OR 1973 ALONE.

6. TOTAL DEFENSE EXPENDITURES BASED ON CURRENT NATIONAL PLANS (COL. 4): THESE PROJECTIONS WERE DERIVED FROM INFORMATION PROVIDED IN DPC/D(73)23 AND FROM INFORMATION

PROVIDED BY U.S. MISSION NATO WHICH INDICATED A 2.8 PERCENT PER YEAR REAL INCREASE IN GREEK DEFENSE EXPENDITURES FOR 1975 AND BEYOND.

### SECTION III: PRIORITY ONE DRAFT GOALS FOR GREECE

1. BY THE PROCEDURE DETAILED IN REF A WE HAVE IDENTIFIED PROPOSALS WHICH MEET THE SECDEF CRITERIA. THESE WERE GIVEN U.S. PRIORITY ONE, INDEPENDENT OF THE MC PRIORITY. IF COSTS WERE INCLUDED WITHIN COUNTRY PLANS, A LETTER C APPEARS IN THE COST COLUMN OF EACH OF THE FOLLOWING THREE TABLES. COSTS INDICATED ARE THOSE COSTS OVER AND ABOVE DRAFT COUNTRY PLANS. TABULATED IN TABLES III-C-1, C-2 AND C-3 BELOW ARE PROPOSED GOALS FOR THE LAND, AIR AND MARITIME FORCES OF GREECE. THOSE PROPOSALS MEETING SECDEF CRITERIA FOR WHICH COSTS HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED AMOUNT TO 34,394 MILLION GREEK DRACHMAE. THAT AMOUNT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE REMAINING COSTS OF PROPOSALS WHICH MET THE SECDEF CRITERIA FOR U.S. PRIORITY ONE, BUT FOR WHICH COSTS HAVE NOT BEEN AVAILABLE.

2. FOR U.S. PRIORITY ONE PROPOSALS, ESTABLISHED IN ACCORD-  
SECRET

PAGE 05 STATE 058908

DANCE WITH CRITERIA OUTLINED IN SECDEF STATENEBS TO NATO. THE U.S. TYPE CODES SHOWN ON THE TABLES ARE AS FOLLOWS:

TYPE CODE	PURPOSE OF PROPOSAL
M	MAINTAIN THE CURRENT SIZE AND READINESS OF FORCES, REPLACING WORN-OUT OR OBSOLETE EQUIPMENT AS NEEDED.
NC	MAKE IMPROVEMENTS THAT HAVE LITTLE OR NO COST.
R/S	TAKE ADVANTAGE OF EFFICIENCIES GAINED THROUGH RATIONALIZATION AND SPECIALIZATION OF FORCES.
AT L	IMPROVE ANTI-ARMOR DEFENSES.
AD	IMPROVE CLOSE IN AIR DEFENSES.
AP	IMPROVE AIRCRAFT PROTECTION THROUGH SHELTERS.
EW	IMPROVE ECM/ECCM CAPABILITIES.
WR	INCREASE WAR RESERVES, ESPECIALLY PRECISION MUNITIONS.

FYI. US POSTURE ON EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE FOR GREECE. AS OF 1 JANUARY 1973. GREECE HAS RENOUNCED ANY FURTHER US GRANT AID. SINCE THAT DATE THE ONLY US ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE TO GREECE IN MEETING NATO FORCE IMPROVEMENT ITEMS IS THE US FMS CREDIT PROGRAM. GREECE HAS PARTICIPATED IN THIS PROGRAM SINCE FY 1969 AND HAS UTILIZED SUCH RESOURCES TO PROCURE F-4 AIRCRAFT AND A MODEST AMOUNT OF OTHER FORCE IMPROVEMENT REQUIREMENTS. SUBJECT TO THE AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS AND CONTINUING STATUTORY AUTHORITY, FMS SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE A SOURCE (COMMERCIAL FUNDING IS ANOTHER) OF EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE FOR GREECE. IN LIGHT OF GREECE'S STRATEGIC LOCATION AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO US AND NATO SECURITY INTERESTS, THE US PROPOSES TO CONTINUE TO PROVIDE AN ADEQUATE LEVEL OF

FMS CREDIT FUNDS TO ENABLE GREECE TO MEET ITS VALID MILITARY REQUIREMENTS.

DURING FY 1969-1974 FMS CREDITS IN THE AMOUNT OF DOLLARS 220 MILLION HAVE BEEN MADE AVAILABLE TO GREECE. FOR FY 1975 A LEVEL OF DOLLARS 71 MILLION IN FMS CREDITS FOR GREECE IS CURRENTLY BEING PROJECTED. UNDER COMMERCIAL FINANCING GREECE CURRENTLY IS PURCHASING A HAWK MISSILE SYSTEM AND IS CONSIDERING THE ACQUISITION OF ASW FRIGATES BY THE SAME METHOD. WE FEEL THAT EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE REQUIREMENTS NEEDED BY GREECE TO MEET NATO SECRET

PAGE 06 STATE 058908

FORCE IMPROVEMENT REQUIREMENTS JUSTIFIES AN ADEQUATE LEVEL OF FMS CREDIT ASSISTANCE FOR GREECE. BECAUSE ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY IS A MATTER FOR BILATERAL, NOT MULTILATERAL, DISCUSSIONS, YOU SHOULD NOT RAISE THE EXTENT OF US PROGRAMS IN THE DRC. AS APPROPRIATE, YOU MIGHT MENTION THE GENERAL NEED FOR ASSISTANCE IF GREECE AND TURKEY ARE TO HAVE VIABLE FUTURE MILITARY PROGRAMS. END FYI.

TABLE III-1: HIGHEST PRIORITY FORCE PROPOSALS

COUNTRY: GREECE FORCE: LAND

1975-80

PROPOSAL COST OVER AND ABOVE MC

SERIAL NO. COUNTRY PLANS PRIORITY U.S. TYPE CODE

1L01	5691.0	I	WR
1L03	412.7	I	AT
1L04	6335.6	I	AD
1L07	C	I	EW
1L09	2579.8	I	WR
1L10	146.3	I	EW
1L13	372.6	I	WR
1L17	COSTS NOT AVAILABLE	I	R/S

TOTALS: 6 AT 15,538

1 AT COSTS NOT AVAILABLE

1 FOR WHICH COSTS ARE INCLUDED IN COUNTRY PLANS

TABLE III-2: HIGHEST PRIORITY FORCE PROPOSALS

COUNTRY: GREECE FORCE: AIR

1975-80

PROPOSAL COST OVER AND ABOVE MC

SERIAL NO. COUNTRY PLANS (MGD) PRIORITY U.S. TYPE CODE

1 A03 (1)	COSTS NOT AVAILABLE	I	EW, NC
1 A04A	(2)	I	EW, NC
1 A04B	(2)	I	EW
1 A04C	(2)	I	EW, NC
1 A04D	(2)	I	EW, NC
1 A05	1320	I	WR
1 A06	58	I	NC
1 A07	912	I	AD
1 A08	619	I	WR, AT

1 A10 6144 I AD  
SECRET

PAGE 07 STATE 058908

1 A12A	COSTS NOT AVAILABLE	I	EW, NC
1 A12B	0 (3)	I	EW, NC
1 A14A	30	II	AD, NC
1 A14B	24	II	AD, NC
1 A14C	24	II	AD, NC
1A18	COSTS NOT AVAILABLE	II	RS
1 A19A	0	II	EW, NC
1 A19B	0 (3)	II	EW, NC
1 A19C	245.4	II	EW, NC
1 A20	130.5	II	NC
1 A22	COSTS NOT AVAILABLE	II	NC
1 A24	462	II	AP
A25	COSTS NOT AVAILABLE	III	NC

TOTALS: 18 AT 10,554.9  
5 AT COSTS NOT AVAILABLE

(1) CHANGE TO "INVESTIGATE MEANS AND DETERMINE COSTS OF PROVIDING...."

(2) TOTAL FOR THESE FOUR ITEMS IS LESS THAN 576 MGD. PREFERENCE FOR PROVISION OF EW EQUIPMENT SHOULD BE GIVEN TO NEWER MODEL AIRCRAFT AS THEY ARE INTRODUCED INTO THE INVENTORY. IT WOULD ALSO BE PREFERABLE, WHERE SUCH A CHOICE IS AVAILABLE, TO APPLY FUNDING TO OBTAINING REPLACEMENTS FOR OLDER MODEL AIRCRAFT RATHER THAN TO PROVIDING EW EQUIPMENT FOR OLDER MODEL AIRCRAFT.

(3) CHANGE TO "INVESTIGATE MEANS TO PROVIDE...."

#### TABLE III-3: HIGHEST PRIORITY FORCE PROPOSALS

COUNTRY: GREECE FORCE: MARITIME

1975-80

PROPOSAL COST OVER AND ABOVE

SERIAL NO. COUNTRY PLANS (MGD) PRIORITY U.S. TYPE CODE

1M01	2,415.6	I	AD
1M04	22.2	I	EW
1M09	4,349.1	I	M
1M10	COSTS NOT AVAILABLE	I	WR
1M11	COSTS NOT AVAILABLE	II	NC
1M12	983.5	II	M

SECRET

PAGE 08 STATE 058908

1M13	80.4	II	M
1M16	440.0	II	M

TOTALS: 6 AT 8,300.8

2 AT COSTS NOT AVAILABLE

SECTION IV: ANALYSIS AND U.S. PROPOSAL

## 1. COST OF PROPOSED U.S. PRIORITY ONE GOALS.

A. THE TOTAL COST OF U.S. SUGGESTED PRIORITY ONE LAND, AIR AND MARITIME DRAFT FORCE GOALS, OVER AND ABOVE CURRENT GREEK COUNTRY PLANS, IS 34,394 MILLION GREEK DRACHMAE. COSTS ARE FROM SHAPE 1240.5/20-2-3/S 54/73, UPDATED BY AC/281(LF)N(74)2.

B. ACCORDINGLY, IF ACCEPTED, THE U.S. PROPOSED FORCE GOALS FOR GREECE WOULD REQUIRE AN EXPENDITURE INCREASE OVER AND ABOVE ESTIMATED CURRENT NATIONAL PLANS (123,949 MILLION GREEK DRACHMAE) OF ABOUT TWENTY-EIGHT PERCENT. THAT AMOUNT WOULD APPEAR TO BE TOO GREAT A BURDEN COMPARED TO THE 23.3 CALCULATED IN SECTION II AS COMPRISING A "REASONABLE CHALLENGE."

C. THE TABLE BELOW SUMMARIZES THE TOTAL COSTS OF U.S. PROPOSED PRIORITY ONE LAND, AIR AND MARITIME DRAFT FORCE GOALS, OVER AND ABOVE CURRENT GREEK COUNTRY PLANS, AND COMPARES THAT TOTAL TO THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT THAT COULD BE SPENT WERE THE GREEKS TO ACCEPT AS A REASONABLE CHALLENGE AN EXPENDITURE THROUGH 1980 OF THE SAME PERCENT OF GNP AS NOW DEVOTED TO DEFENSE, OR 152,799 MILLION GREEK DRACHMAE.

TABLE IV: ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR DRAFT FORCE GOALS AVAILABLE 1975-1980 AT CURRENT PERCENT OF GNP 28,850 LESS IDENTIFIED COSTS OF U.S. PRIORITY

ONE PROPOSALS	34,394
BALANCE AVAILABLE (DEFICIT)	- 5,544

## 2. GREEK ABILITY TO INCREASE EXPENDITURES.

## 2. GREEK ABILITY TO INCREASE EXPENDITURES.

A. THE GREEK GOVERNMENT HAS ESTIMATED THAT EXTERNAL AID WOULD BE NECESSARY FOR IT TO ADOPT MANY OF THE MC PROPOSALS, AND IT HAS IMPLIED THAT NATIONAL RESOURCES MIGHT BE ABLE TO SUPPORT PROPOSALS COSTING AS MUCH AS 10,450 MILLION GREEK DRACHMAE OVER CURRENT COUNTRY PLANS (AC/281(LF)N(74)2).

B. THIS IS OVER ONE THIRD OF THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OVER SECRET

PAGE 09 STATE 058908

COUNTRY PLANS THAT WOULD BE SPENT WERE THE GREEKS TO ACCEPT OUR REASONABLE CHALLENGE.

## 3. THE U.S. SHOULD, THEREFORE, PROPOSE THAT:

A. GREECE, ALONG WITH THE OTHER NATO COUNTRIES, ADOPT AS A GOAL THE MAINTENANCE OF A CONSTANT SHARE OF GNP TO NATIONAL DEFENSE. HAVING A RELATIVELY LOW GNP DOES NOT MEAN THAT A CONSTANT SHARE OF THAT GNP CANNOT BE DEVOTED TO DEFENSE.

B. GREECE ACCEPT AS DRAFT FORCE GOALS ALL LISTED FORCE PROPOSALS FOR WHICH (A) COSTS OVER AND ABOVE PRESENT COUNTRY PLANS HAVE BEEN FULLY IDENTIFIED, AND (B) SUCH COSTS BE ACCOMMODATED WITHIN A "REASONABLE CHALLENGE" DERIVED BY THE METHOD DETAILED IN SECTION II ABOVE;

C. GREECE CONSIDER WHICH, IF ANY, OF THE FORCE PROPOSALS

IN COUNTRY PLANS BUT EXCLUDING FROM THE LOF U. S.

PROPOSED FORCE GOALS IT MIGHT WISH TO ACCEPT AS PRIORITY  
TWO OR THREE, OR DROP ALTOGETHER;

D. TO THE EXTENT THAT FUNDS MIGHT BE RELEASED BY SUCH  
DECISIONS, GREECE CONSIDER ACCEPTING AS PRIORITY ONE  
AND REALLOCATING FREED FUNDS TO SOME ADDITIONAL ITEMS ON  
THE LIST OF U.S. PROPOSED FORCE GOALS; AND

E. FIRST PRIORITY BE GIVEN TO THOSE PROPOSALS CARRYING  
THE HIGHEST MC PRIORITY AND APPEARING IN THE LIST OF  
U.S. PROPOSED FORCE GOALS.

4. WASHINGTON WILL CONTINUE TO KEEP THE EVALUATION OF  
NATO FORCE GOALS UNDER CAREFUL REVIEW IN THE LIGHT OF  
DEVELOPMENTS REPORTED BY THE MISSION AND WILL BE PRE-  
PARED TO SUPPLEMENT OR REVISE GUIDANCE AS MAY BE CON-  
SIDERED APPROPRIATE.

KISSINGER

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>



## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 27 JUL 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** BURDENSARING, DATA, MILITARY BUDGET, PROGRAMS (PROJECTS), MILITARY PLANS, COLLECTIVE SECURITY AGREEMENTS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 23 MAR 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** garlanwa  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974STATE058908  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:**  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** D740063-0273  
**From:** STATE  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740382/abbrzcqd.tel  
**Line Count:** 399  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ORIGIN EUR  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 8  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** (A) STATE 42348, (B) MCM-14-74, (C) USNATO 1262  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** garlanwa  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 10 APR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <10 APR 2002 by ifshinsr>; APPROVED <30-Aug-2002 by garlanwa>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** n/a  
**TAGS:** MCAP, GR, NATO  
**To:** NATO INFO ATHENS  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
USDELMC  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

